



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,450	04/14/2004	Kathleen M. Carmichael	D/A2533	8333

7590 12/16/2005

Patent Documentation Center
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20th Floor
100 Clinton Ave. S.
Rochester, NY 14644

EXAMINER

NOTE, JANIS L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1756

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,450

Applicant(s)

CARMICHAEL ET AL.

Examiner

Janis L. Dote

Art Unit

1756

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/14/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1756

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description:

In Fig. 3, the reference **84**. See the instant specification, paragraphs 0044 to 0050.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

(1) In paragraph 0001, the specification does not identify the copending US applications by serial numbers.

(2) There are spelling errors throughout the specification. For example, the misspelling "drelt" in the phrase "drelt photoreceptor 10" in paragraph 0022, line 8. This example is not exhaustive. Applicants should review the entire specification to correct the spelling errors.

Art Unit: 1756

(3) The use of trademarks, e.g., Mor-Ester 49,000 [sic: MOR-ESTER 49,000] in paragraph 0074, line 3, has been noted in this application. The trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and be accompanied by the generic terminology. This example is not exhaustive. Applicants should review the entire specification for compliance.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted element is an electrically conductive

Art Unit: 1756

substrate or a substrate comprising an electrically conductive layer.

Instant claims 1-18 recite an electrostatographic imaging member comprising a flexible supporting substrate, an imaging layer, and an anti-curling layer.

Instant claim 19 recites a photoreceptor having a charge-retentive surface and comprising a substrate, an imaging layer to receive an electrostatic latent image thereon, and an anti-curling layer.

Instant claim 19 recites a photoreceptor having a charge-retentive surface and comprising a substrate, an imaging layer to receive an electrostatic latent image thereon, and at least one layer other than the imaging layer that comprises a lignin sulfonic acid doped polyaniline dispersion.

The claims fail to recite that the electrostatographic imaging members and the photoreceptors have an electrically conductive substrate or a substrate comprising an electrically conductive layer. The specification in paragraph 0005 discloses that "[f]lexible electrophotographic imaging members, including photoreceptors, photosensitive members, and photoconductors, and the like, typically include a photoconductive layer formed on an electrically conductive flexible substrate . . . [t]he photoconductive layer is an insulator in the dark, so that

Art Unit: 1756

electric charge are retained on its surface. Upon exposure to light, the charge is dissipated, and an image can be formed [latent charge image]." Also see paragraph 0022 of the specification, which discloses forming an electrostatic latent image on a photoreceptor. The specification discloses that the flexible substrate may comprise a layer of an electrically conductive material. The specification further teaches that when the substrate is not conductive, the surface of the substrate may be "rendered conductive by an electrically conductive coating." Specification, paragraphs 0026 and 0027. All the examples in the instant specification comprise a supporting substrate having thereon an electrically conductive layer. A conductive support or a support comprising a conductive coating is an essential component of an electrophotographic element to form an "electrostatic latent image." See Diamond, Handbook of Imaging Materials, pp. 395-396. Diamond Figure 9.7 shows a typical dual-layer photoreceptor, which comprises an electrode layer. It is not clear how imaging members or photoreceptors that lack an electrically conductive substrate or a substrate comprising an electrically conductive layer can form an electrostatic latent image. There is no objective evidence on the present record showing that electrostatic latent images can be formed on an

Art Unit: 1756

imaging member comprising a non-conductive or insulating substrate.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. An electrically conductive substrate or a substrate comprising an electroconductive layer is critical or essential to the practice of the invention. The instant claims do not recite the presence of an electrically conductive substrate or a substrate comprising an electroconductive layer. Therefore, the instant claims are not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976).

Instant claims 1-20 recite imaging members and photoreceptors as described in paragraph 4, supra, which is incorporated herein by reference. The specification does not disclose or teach an imaging member or a photoreceptor that does not comprise an electrically conductive substrate or a substrate

Art Unit: 1756

comprising an electrically conductive layer. All the examples in the instant specification comprise a supporting substrate having thereon an electrically conductive layer. For the reasons given in paragraph 4, supra, it is not clear how imaging members that lack an electrically conductive substrate or a substrate comprising an electrically conductive layer can form an electrostatic latent image. There is no objective evidence on the present record showing that electrostatic latent images can be formed on an imaging member or a photoreceptor comprising a non-conductive or insulating substrate. Thus, all the evidence in the instant specification indicates that an imaging member or a photoreceptor that does not comprise an electrically conductive substrate or a substrate comprising an electrically conductive layer cannot form an electrostatic latent image. Hence, on the present record, it would have required undue experimentation for one of ordinary skill in the art to use an imaging member or a photoreceptor that does not have an electrically conductive substrate or a substrate comprising an electrically conductive layer to form an electrostatic latent image. The full scope of the instant claimed subject matter cannot be practiced based on the limited disclosure provided by the instant specification.

Art Unit: 1756

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f), or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,382,486 (Yu'486), as evidenced by applicants' admissions in paragraph 0078 of the instant specification (applicants' admission I) and US 5,021,309 (Yu'309), combined with US 6,932,921 B2 (Service) and US 6,764,617 B1 (Viswanathan).

The disclosure relied on Service for the rejection has an effective filing date of Jan. 6, 2003, as evidenced by

Art Unit: 1756

provisional application 60/438,171 (Application'171), of which Service claims the benefit of priority.

Yu'486 discloses a photoreceptive imaging web member comprising a flexible substrate having thereon in order, a conductive layer, a charge generation layer, and a charge transport layer. The imaging member further comprises a conductive anti-curl layer on the flexible substrate on the side opposite to the charge generation layer and the charge transport layer. See col. 6, lines 43-49; col. 17, line 27, to col. 19, line 2; and example IV at col. 19. The anti-curl layer had a layer thickness of 14 μm , which meets the layer thickness range of about 5 to about 60 μm recited in instant claim 17. The anti-curl layer comprises 23 wt% of a conductive polymer dispersion and 75 wt% of a polymer blend, which comprises 92 parts by weight of a polycarbonate resin associated with trademark MAKROLON 5707 from Bayer AG and 8 parts by weight of a polyester resin associated with the trademark VITEL PE-2000 from Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company. The instant specification identifies the polycarbonate resin associated with the trademark MAKROLON 5707 as a bisphenol A polycarbonate resin, i.e., poly(4,4'-isopropylidene-diphenylene carbonate. Instant specification, paragraph 0078, lines 9-10. The polycarbonate resin associated with MAKROLON 5707 meets the film forming

Art Unit: 1756

binder limitations recited in instant claims 5-7. Yu'309 identifies the polyester resin associated with the trademark VITEL PE-200 as a copolyester adhesion promoter. Yu'309, col. 12, lines 41-45. The polyester resin associated with the trademark VITEL PE-200 in the Yu'486 anti-curling layer is present in an amount of 8.7 wt% based on the weight of the polycarbonate film forming resin associated with the trademark MAKROLON 5707. The amount of 8.7 wt% based on the weight of film forming polymer is within the amount ranges recited in instant claims 10 and 11. The amount of 8.7 wt% was determined by the information provided in example IV in Yu'486. The polyester resin associated with the trademark VITEL PE-200 in the Yu'486 anti-curling layer meets the adhesion promoter limitations recited in instant claims 8-11. The Yu'486 amount of the conductive polymer dispersion of 23 wt% based on the weight of the total solids in the anti-curling layer is within the amount range recited in instant claim 2. The Yu'486 amount of 23 wt% is within the ranges of "about 5 to about 20 percent by weight" and of "about 6 to about 10 percent by weight" of total solids recited in instant claims 3 and 4, respectively. The term "about" admits variation. There is no disclosure in the instant specification of critical properties that exclude the Yu'486 amount of 23 wt% from the upper limit amounts, "about

Art Unit: 1756

20 weight percent" and "about 10 weight percent," of the amount ranges recited in instant claims 3 and 4. Thus, the Yu'486 amount of 23 wt% of the conductive polymer in the Yu'486 anti-curl layer is within the ranges recited in instant claims 3 and 4.

According to Yu'486, a photoreceptor comprising its conductive anti-curl layer "maintains conductivity for longer periods of time to prevent electrostatic charge build-up during imaging belt machine operations." Col. 6, lines 28-33. The conductive anti-curl backing layer produces "no negative adhesion effect." Col. 20, lines 50-54.

Yu'486 does not exemplify an anti-curl layer comprising a lignin sulfonic acid doped polyaniline dispersion as recited in the instant claims. The conductive polymer dispersion in the exemplified Yu'486 anti-curl layer in example IV is a conductive acid-doped polyaniline dispersion. Col. 14, lines 57-58, and reference claim 1. Yu'489 teaches that "any suitable acid may be utilized for doping aniline," for example, "sulfuric acid . . . methane sulfonic acid . . . and the like." Col. 15, lines 24-27.

Service discloses conductive polymer films comprising a lignosulfonic acid doped polyaniline dispersed in the polymer film. Service, col. 2, lines 14-18 and 24-27; Application'171,

Art Unit: 1756

page 2, line 34, to page 3, line 2, and page 3, lines 9-11.

According to Service, lignosulfonates are byproducts of the paper making industry and are environmentally safe and inexpensive. The lignosulfonic acid improves the solubility of the conjugated π -system, polyaniline. Service, col. 1, lines 23-26; Application'171, page 1, lines 20-22. Viswanathan teaches that the lignosulfonates comprise multiple sulfonic acid groups that can be used for doping polymers. Col. 5, lines 20-22.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Service and Viswanathan, to use a lignosulfonic acid as the acid dopant in the conductive acid doped polyamide resin disclosed by Yu'486 in the anti-curl layer disclosed by Yu'486. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining a photoreceptive imaging web member comprising a conductive anti-curl backing layer, which comprises an environmentally safe and inexpensive lignosulfonic acid doped polyaniline resin, that has desired properties disclosed by Yu'486.

10. Claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu'486, as evidenced by applicants'

Art Unit: 1756

admission I and Yu'309, combined with Service and Viswanathan, as applied to claim 1 above, further combined with Yu'309.

Yu'486, as evidenced by applicants' admission I and Yu'309, combined with Service and Viswanathan, renders obvious an electrophotographic photoreceptive imaging web member as described in paragraph 9 above, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Yu'486 does not exemplify an anti-curl layer comprising a filler as recited in instant claims 12-14.

Yu'309 teaches anti-curl backing layers comprising organic fillers. The organic fillers include fluorocarbon polymers, such as irregularly shaped polytetrafluoroethylene (PTFE) particles, or irregularly shaped polyethylene wax particles. Col. 13, line 42, to col. 14, line 6, and examples III and VI. The irregularly shaped PTFE particles or polyethylene wax particles meet the filler limitations recited in instant claims 12-14. According to Yu'309, the organic fillers have "inherently wear-resisting characteristics and are capable of providing lubricity to ease the sliding mechanical interaction at the anti-curl layer surface." Col. 13, lines 34-38. The anti-curl backing layer has improved wear resistance and increased durability and exhibits greater resistance to layer de-lamination. Col. 3, lines 18-19 and 24-36.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the teachings of Yu'309, to incorporate an organic filler, such as irregularly shaped PTFE particles or polyethylene wax particles, as taught by Yu'309 in the anti-curl layer rendered obvious over the teachings of Yu'486, as evidenced by applicants' admission I and Yu'309, combined with the teachings of Service and Viswanathan, and to use the resultant anti-curl layer in the photoreceptive member disclosed by Yu'486. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining a photoreceptive image web member that comprises an anti-curl layer that has improved wear resistance and increased durability and exhibits greater resistance to layer de-lamination.

11. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu'486, as evidenced by applicants' admission I and Yu'309, combined with Service and Viswanathan, as applied to claim 1, further combined with US 5,737,669 (Ring) and Diamond, Handbook of Imaging Materials, pages 395-396 (Diamond).

Yu'486, as evidenced by applicants' admission I and Yu'309, combined with Service and Viswanathan, renders obvious an electrophotographic photoreceptive imaging web member as

Art Unit: 1756

described in paragraph 9 above, which is incorporated herein by reference.

Yu'486 does not exemplify an image forming apparatus as recited in instant claims 19 and 20.

As shown in Diamond, it is well-known in the art that an image loop (i.e., an endless belt) can be fabricated from a flexible web comprising a conductive layer and a photoreceptor layer where the ends of the web are joined together to form an endless belt. Diamond, page 396, lines 4-5.

According to Ring, a laser or LED-array printer comprising a photoreceptive image-carrying drum has several disadvantages. See Ring, col. 1, line 36, to col. 2, line 9. For example, Ring teaches that "the drum . . . and the . . . [other] elements positioned adjacent the drum surface are relatively large elements since they all must be at least as wide as a sheet of a printing medium, on the order of 8.5 to 12 inches or larger." Col. 1, lines 37-42. Ring also discloses that "if an LED-array head is employed . . . the head must be at least as wide as the drum . . . so that an electrostatic image is formed on the drum surface during a single pass of the drum." Ring discloses that "if a laser is employed, relatively sophisticated mirrors and/or prisms must be employed for the same purpose." The "relatively long LED-array head or the lasers and related optical devices

Art Unit: 1756

represent a significant portion of the cost of producing the drum printer." Col. 1, lines 46-55. To overcome these disadvantages, Ring discloses a small-scale and inexpensive electrophotographic printer comprising a photoreceptive member in the form of an endless belt **20** stretched over rollers **26a** and **26b**. Fig. 2; col. 4, lines 20-36; and col. 4, line 50, to col. 5, line 52. According to Ring, its electrophotographic printer requires a relatively short LED array and can form multichrome or color images at a relatively low cost. Col. 9, lines 39-45. The apparatus disclosed by Ring further comprises a charging device **34**, a developing unit **38**, a transfer mechanism **46** that transfers the toner image from the photoreceptive member to the printing medium **12**, and a fixing mechanism **48** to fix the transferred toner image to the printing medium **12**. Figs. 2 and 3; col. 4, lines 58-60; col. 6, lines 12-20; and col. 6, line 66, to col. 7, line 6.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of teachings of Diamond and Ring, to form an endless flexible belt from the photoreceptive imaging web member rendered obvious over the teachings of Yu'486, as evidenced by applicants' admission I and Yu'309, combined with the teachings of Service and Viswanathan, as taught by Diamond. It would also have been obvious for that person to use the

Art Unit: 1756

resultant photoreceptive flexible belt in the electrophotographic printer taught by Ring. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining a small-scale electrophotographic printer that is capable of providing multichrome and color images at a relatively low cost.

12. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

13. Claim 20 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being

unpatentable over claims 19 and 20 of copending Application No. 10/824,794 (Application'794).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter recited in the claims of Application'794 renders obvious the subject matter recited in instant claim 20.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Reference claims 19 and 20 recite an image forming apparatus comprising a photoreceptor, a development component, a transfer member, and a fixing component. The photoreceptor has a charge-retentive surface to receive an electrostatic latent image thereon, and comprises a flexible support, an imaging layer to receive the electrostatic latent image thereon, and an electrically conductive ground strip. The electrically conductive ground strip comprises a film forming polymer binder and a lignin sulfonic acid doped polyaniline dispersion. The ground strip meets the limitation of the "at least one layer other than the imaging layer" recited in instant claim 20.

It would have been obvious for a person having ordinary skill in the art, in view of the subject matter recited in the claims of Application '794, to make an use a photoreceptor that

Art Unit: 1756

meets the photoreceptor limitations recited in instant claim 20 and to use the resultant photoreceptor in the image forming apparatus recited in the claims of Application'794. That person would have had a reasonable expectation of successfully obtaining an image forming apparatus that is capable of forming fixed-toned images on copy substrates.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janis L. Dote whose telephone number is (571) 272-1382. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Huff, can be reached on (571) 272-1385. The central fax phone number is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry regarding papers not received regarding this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Supervisory Application Examiner Ms. Claudia Sullivan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-1052.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JLD

Dec. 2, 2005

Janis L. Dote
JANIS L. DOTE
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 1756
1700